

**REMARKS**

**I. Overview**

These remarks are set forth in response to the New Non-Final Office Action.

Presently, claims 1 through 8 and 10 through 14 are pending in the Patent Application. Claims 1 and 8 are independent in nature. In the New Non-Final Office Action, each of claims 1, 2, 7, 8 and 10 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent No. 6,563,955 to de Quieroz in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0093568 by Deshpande. Further, claims 1 through 4, 8 and 10 through 12 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0007703 by Roylance in view of Deshpande. Yet further, claims 6 and 14 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over de Quieroz and Deshpande and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,055,017 to Shen et al. (Shen), and also over Roylance in view of Shen. Finally, claims 5 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roylance and Deshpande in view of Jong Whan Jang et al., Performance Evaluation of Scene Change Detection Algorithms (Jang) and also de Queiroz and Deshpande in view of Jang. In response, **Applicant has amended claims 1 and 8 consistently with the teachings of a shared application set forth in paragraph [0003] of Applicants' originally filed Specification.**

**II. The Applicant's Invention**

The Applicants have invented a system, method and apparatus for the componentized configuration of a shared application server based upon varying shared

application types. In accordance with the present invention, a shared application server can be configured to interoperate with pluggable image processing logic based upon the requirements of a shared application hosted in the shared application server. Where the hosted shared application requires high fidelity imaging, pluggable image processing logic can be selected to achieve lossless image capturing and compression. By comparison, where the shared application requires high transmission speeds regardless of image fidelity, image processing logic can be selected to achieve high image compression ratios and small image packaging sizes. In this way, the characteristics of the shared application can be considered in configuring the shared application server.

### III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §§ 103(a)

#### A. Characterization of Deshpande

Deshpande is directed to a remote desktop communication protocol that includes spatial and temporal compression techniques. In Deshpande, multimedia presentation data is generated at a server from a source. A compression facility modifies the presentation data by both spatially and temporally compressing the presentation data to transmittable data. In some embodiments, a check is performed to ensure that the least amount of data is selected prior to sending the transmittable data to a remote client. The remote client receives the transmittable data and re-constructs the original multimedia presentation data. In some embodiments that use lossy compression, the reconstruction may not exactly re-construct the original multimedia presentation data. Once re-created, the remote client presents the presentation data at the remote client. The presentation data could be audio, video, or other data or a combination of them.

B. Argument

Deshpande clearly pertains to distribution of video from a server to viewer clients.

Paragraph [0036] of Deshpande provides:

[0036] Once the video clip is available to the server 30 , a video display program, or other suitable process runs on the server. For example, the server 30 may run a standard or streaming video player, flash program, or other application that converts the desired data into a series of images to make frames of a video. Instead of displaying the image on the display 32 of the server 30 , however, the server codes the display data and sends it over the communication pipeline 24 with commands to show it on the display 22 of the thin client 10 . The display 32 of the server 30 may show an indication that a process is running, and the video that is shown on the display 22 of the thin client 10 may in fact also be shown on the display 32 of the server. But the central focus of the system is to show the desired video on the display 22 of the thin client 10 .

A shared application as understood by the skilled artisan is not merely a remote video session but the shared viewing of a common application remotely including user interface interactions such as mouse pointer movements. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 8 consistently with paragraph [0003] of Applicants' originally filed Specification to provide for the transmission not only of image frames of the shared application, but also mouse pointer movements of the shared application. Deshpande, of course, lacks such a teaching since Deshpande pertains to the distribution of a video clip that is not interactive as would be the case with a shared application.

IV. Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) owing to the amended and cancelled claims and the foregoing remarks. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed

on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 21, 2010

/Steven M. Greenberg/

Steven M. Greenberg, Reg. No.: 44,725  
Carey, Rodríguez, Greenberg & Paul, LLP  
**Customer No. 46321**